09/774,992

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 are pending.

Applicant notes from the Office Action that the Examiner specifically states "It is obvious that these cognitive signatures act as a fault finding test script file that contains a number of tests that can be performed on the system." However, Applicant would like to respectfully point out that the cognitive signatures disclosed in Garg et al. are not fault finding test script files which contain tests which can be performed on the system as suggested by the Examiner. The cognitive signatures in Garg et al. are simply historical data (see column 6, lines 6-11 and lines 58-64 in the specification of Garg et al.). If the Examiner continues to reject claims 1-21 by applying Garg et al., it is respectfully requested that the Examiner explain how "a test script file" and "data" could mean the same thing when the two terms are clearly different in meaning.

Each of claims 1-7 recites, inter alia, "(e) updating the retrieved fault finding test script file of step (c) based upon test results from tests which have been performed on the system in step (d)", each of claims 8-14 recites, inter alia, "means for updating the retrieved fault finding test script file based upon test results from tests which have been performed on the system", and each of claims 15-21 recites, inter alia, "(e) updating the retrieved fault finding test script file of step (c) based upon test results from tests which have been performed on the system in step (d)". None of the prior art including Garg et al. discloses or suggests that a fault finding test script file is being updated based upon test results from tests which have been performed. While the cognitive signatures (i.e., the historical data) in Garg et al. may be updated, there is no disclosure or suggestion of a fault finding test script file being updated. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-21 by applying Garg et al. is improper and, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that this response should be entered to overcome the rejections stated in the final Office Action. The response was not earlier presented

7

09/774,992

because the Applicant did not know of the Examiner's position with respect to the rejections until receiving the final Office Action.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Chan
Reg. No. 33,663
Attorney for Applicant

NCR Corporation, Law Department, WHQ4
1700 S. Patterson Blvd., Dayton, OH 45479-0001
Tel. 937-445-4956/Fax 937-445-3733

MAR 15 2004

8